

REMARKS

With respect to paragraph 3 and the notation with respect to the trademark Bluetooth, it is believed that Bluetooth is a trademark for certain types of goods. The use of Bluetooth in the present application does not refer to those goods but, instead, refers to the specification. See, for example, page 4, lines 20 and 21. Therefore, it is not believed that a trademark usage is made within the present application and reconsideration is requested.

The rejection of claim 11 is not fully understood. It is noted that this same language has been in the application from the beginning and no objection was made. Thus, to the extent that the rejection is maintained, the assertion of a new rejection would seem to make the finality of the present objection improper. It is indicated that signals cannot store. It is believed that the objection is based on the possibility that the claim might cover signals. But the argument that signals cannot store suggests that the medium could not constitute a signal. Therefore, the claimed language "medium storing instructions" would appear to preclude mere signals.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

With respect to the rejection under Section 102, it is noted that nothing in Bodenmann ever suggests establishing a connection, storing the information exchanged to establish that connection, and use that stored information to reestablish the connection. Instead, the point of Bodenmann is to establish a standardized communication protocol. See Bodenmann abstract.

Even if Bodenmann stores certain information about certain types of devices, that information is pre-stored from the beginning. It is not stored after it is exchanged to establish a connection. The present application calls for an article to store information exchanged to establish a connection between a cableless provider and a consumer and then to use that stored information to reestablish the connection.


Even if one were to assume that what Bodenmann is storing in the cited section is used to establish a connection, there is nothing to indicate anything other than that information was stored from the beginning of the establishment of the device. It is not stored after it is exchanged to establish a connection. Therefore, there is no use of that stored information exchanged to establish a connection to reestablish a connection.

For this reason alone, the reference fails to meet the claimed limitations. Moreover, there is nothing to suggest that any of the information called status-and-complementary information is

used to establish a connection in any instance. Therefore, for this even more basic reason, reconsideration of the rejection would be appropriate.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation